

the filter top surface in contact with the slurry being filtered. As pointed out by the Examiner, the volume through which arrow 31 passes is, prior to use of the filtration cartridge, an open void volume upstream of "said depth filter". However, when the slurry to be filtered is introduced into the filtration cartridge, air is forced from the cartridge and replaced by the slurry. Since the inlet to the first filter segment, 20 (Fig. 1) has the same area and configuration of the first-contacted surface of the first filter segment, no air is entrapped between the slurry and the first contacted surface of the first filter segment. This configuration contrasts with the inlets in the filtration cartridge of the cited Price '628 reference. The inlets of Price are smaller than and have a different configuration than the top surface of the filter. When utilizing such a configuration, the particles of a slurry to be filtered would separate from the slurry. If, on the other hand, Price's top surface of the filter were in contact with the outlet of the inlet, no undesirable void volume would be formed. Accordingly, this ground of rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 5 and 6 have been rejected under 35 USC 102 (b) over Price. As set forth above, Price discloses a filter cartridge which effects air entrapment upstream of the filter after filtration is initiated. Applicants' construction avoids this air entrapment. Accordingly, it is submitted that the rejection based on Price should be withdrawn.

Claims 5 and 6 have been rejected under 35 USC '03 over Price and Megesi. It is the Examiner's position that it would be obvious to employ the Price filter such as the spent photographic solution of silver, not with filtering a slurry. The silver in solution is exchanged with a method comprising a filter medium such as steel wool. The iron of the steel wool goes into solution while the silver is chemically deposited on the steel wool. Accordingly, since Megesi is not concerned with filtering a slurry, it does not supply the deficiencies of Price. Accordingly, this ground of rejection should be withdrawn.

It is requested that the Examiner reconsider the request to limit the independent process claims to a ceria-based slurry since the process is the same regardless of the slurry being filtered. The filter does not react either chemically or biologically with the particles being filtered. In all case, the filter functions to effect retention of larger particles in the slurry while permitting passage therethrough of particles of desired size in the slurry. Success in the filtration process does not depend upon the chemical or biological composition of the slurry.

In view of the above, it is submitted that applicants' claims define patentable subject matter and an early Notice of Allowance to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 1/31/03

By: 
Paul J. Cook
Registration No. 20,820
Attorney for Applicants
Mykrolis Corporation
129 Concord Road
Billerica, MA 10821-4600
Tel (978) 436-6528
Fax (97) 436-6739